

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/935,366	BAZAN, J. FERNANDO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Prema M Mertz	1646	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Prema M Mertz (Primary Examiner). (3) _____.

(2) Laurie L. Hill (Attorney). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 02 February 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 18-24.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Prema Mertz
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: It was indicated to Laurie Hill that the declaration submitted on 12/2/2003 recites that Applicants have reviewed amendments filed on 3/2002 and 1/2003 and no changes arose without deceptive intent. Yet the latest amendment submitted on 12/2/2003 was filed after 1/03. It is not clear that applicants had reviewed latest amendment and could also say it arose without deceptive intent. Furthermore, new claim 23 is improperly dependent on claim 18 because it is broader than claim 18. With respect to claim 22, the recitation of "variant" precipitates a 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection ("variant" of what?). Appropriate correction of these claims is requested before the claims can be rendered allowable .